

THE EXAMINER

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

LOUISVILLE KY.: SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1849.

WHOLE NUMBER 103.

VOLUME II.

THE EXAMINER;

Published Weekly, on Jefferson St., next door but one to the Post Office.

TERMS.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE, SIX COPIES FOR TEN DOLLARS.

PAUL SEYMOUR.

REVIEW.

Of a Lecture on the North and the South, delivered in Cincinnati, January 16, 1849, by ELIZABETH FISH.

Mr. Fisher is said to be a Quaker, and his Lecture was delivered before the Young Men's Library Association, in Cincinnati. These circumstances are remarkable. The Friends or Quakers have, as a body, long opposed Slavery, as a violation of natural right and of the Christian law of benevolence. Cincinnati is a free city, the wonderful product of free labor. Yet in the midst of this city, and within the limits of one Ohio, which, fifty years ago, was a wilderness, and is now one of the greatest and most flourishing Commonwealths in America, a Quaker rises up and argues that Slavery is a blessing to mankind,—the product of wealth, comfort and civilization, and therefore to be cherished and maintained forever, by those who have the good fortune to possess its enviable advantages. Mr. Fisher argues to this effect throughout his Lecture. He attempts to demonstrate that the people of the Southern States are, by the use of negro slavery, more wealthy, more comfortable, more civilized and more virtuous than those of the North, and that whereas emancipation, present or prospective, are, if not impracticable, at least highly inexpedient and dangerous to the public welfare.

No Virginian or Kentuckian advocate of personal slavery, no South Carolinian Nullifier, did ever, so far as we know, exhibit more real and sincere defence of the "peculiar institution," than Mr. Fisher, the Quaker of Cincinnati, in Ohio.

We have no right or disposition to censor him for entertaining and expressing his opinion. We only regret that he did not exhibit more candor and fairness in arguing for the cause which he espoused.

He professes to argue from statistical facts. But he only catches at a few here and there, as he finds them capable of being turned to his purpose of showing a superiority of wealth and comfort in the Slave-holding States. In the application of his facts, or, perhaps, facts, he adopts principles that are most unreasonable, and reasonings the most fallacious and absurd. To give an air of plausibility to them, he often resorts to looseness of expression, where exactness would not have served his turn; perverts facts, which, if fairly stated, would have made against his arguments; shifts his ground backwards and forwards, assuming the most opposite positions at different times, to suit the immediate occasion, without regard to consistency; and utters a great deal of absurdity and nonsense with most philosophical gravity, to give an air of weight and profoundness to his argument.

We are sorry to be obliged to censure his method of arguing with so much severity, but a regard to the general welfare of the South requires a just exposure of his productions, and we shall make good our reasons by examples fairly quoted in his own words, and demonstrated to be of the character that we have assigned them.

He begins with undertaking to show that "during the first quarter of a century under present form of government [that is, from 1790 to 1815,] the South had surpassed the North in commerce, in manufactures and in the accumulation of wealth, in proportion to the number of citizens in the respective sections."

He says truly, that in 1790, the two sections were about equal in population and wealth. But even here, where he had least need, he shows a disposition to conceal unfavorable facts under a loose form of expression, when he could as easily have said the simple truth without disguise. He says (page 1.) that "the territory then occupied by the two (the North and the South) was perhaps nearly equal in extent and fertility." Why this cautious vagueness of language to convey a false impression? Why did he not say, in plain terms, what we presume, he knew well enough, namely—that the Southern States then possessed, as the same old States now possess, a territory larger, by some 60,000 square miles, than the territory of the same Northern States—the Indian land being deducted from both? But this fact did not suit Mr. Fisher; it would have shown that from the beginning the Southern States had a great natural advantage for increase of population and wealth.

For the first quarter of a century, says he, p. 2, "up to 1816, the South took the lead of the North in commerce, and at the end of that period the exports of the Southern States amounted to about thirty millions, which was five millions more than the Northern."

Supporting his statement to be correct, he would have said that the South then exported more to foreign countries than the North. Commerce includes imports as well as exports, domestic as well as foreign trade, the carrying trade as well as the direct. The North was then, as now, more commercial, though the South, then, as now, exported a larger portion of her productions to foreign countries. He should have indicated that a part of the exports from the Southern ports of Baltimore and New Orleans, were, and are the products of Northern States. But this is his way of dealing with statistics. When he finds a fact which in the gross can be turned to the advantage of his argument, but which, on being analyzed, would make the contrary way, he jumps it, and draws his conclusion at once, without a hint of the deductions or additions that should be made, in order to arrive at a correct result. In this, too, as in other instances, he takes a fact relative to a part of the subject, and draws from it a conclusion that covers the whole subject, as he here infers the whole amount of trade from the export to foreign countries.

Nem he argues (on p. 2.) that in 1815 the Southern people were wealthier than the Northern. He had argued that with their natural advantages they ought to have been wealthier, we could have agreed with him at once. But we must examine his argument concerning the fact that they were

assessment of taxable property made than for as the basis of direct taxes. According to this assessment the taxable property of the South amounted to \$859,500, and that of the North to \$1,042,700. Dividing these sums by the number of people in the two sections respectively, according to the preceding census of 1810, we find in the South an average amount of property about thirty dollars less per head than in the North. But as the North had, since 1810, increased a little faster in population than the South, we may assign a difference of twenty-five dollars a head in favor of the North, according to their assessment, which cannot however be relied on as an accurate valuation of the property of the two sections. Assessments for taxation are apt to vary considerably from the truth, because individuals are interested, for the most part in undervaluing, but sometimes in overvaluing their property. Much property, too, escapes this sort of assessment altogether—especially in the North, where there is so much invisible property in the form of stocks, bonds, cash, &c.

But how is this? Mr. Fisher makes the average wealth of the Southern people exceed that of the Northern by seventy-two dollars a head. How does he bring this difference about? He takes white population as population, and negro slaves as property only, putting them with the cattle and swine, as live stock, and nothing else. By this crafty management, he greatly reduces the Southern population, and thus brings out a much larger average of property for the Southern people. If he had, at the same time, deducted the value of the slaves from the amount of Southern property, there would have been something like fairness in the procedure. But this would not have suited his purpose, because then the average of Northern wealth would have been still greater.

Now the main drift of Mr. Fisher's argument is to show that slavery is a blessing, because it promotes the accumulation of wealth. "The first object of civilized life," says he, on p. 4, "is to accumulate wealth, as on that depends improvement in science and the arts, and the supply of the multiplied wants of society."

Having made this the test point, in order to determine whether an institution such as slavery is good or evil, he then proceeds to make out that slavery promotes the accumulation of wealth in the Southern States, and is therefore a blessing to them. But he could not make this out—or rather he could not find even a plausible way of seeming to make out something like it, if he considered the slaves as human beings, or as constituting any part of the population of the country, for then, when he came to divide the aggregate wealth of States by their population, his Southern States would be found in arrears, even when slaves were valued as a part of their wealth. But when he deducted them from the population, after adding them to the wealth, then he found two or three slave States which seemed to be wealthier than two or three free States, in proportion to free population, and on these partial and seeming results he founded his conclusion that slavery promotes the accumulation of wealth in the Southern States.

Now, if it were proved to demonstration, that slavery promotes the wealth of slaveholders, or even of the free population of a State, slavery might still be an evil and deplorable thing on account of the wrong inflicted on the slaves, and the check that it imposes on the increase of population, the development of the resources of the country, the diffusion of knowledge, and the cultivation of arts and literature.

But apart from the question—whether the accumulation of wealth is the proper test of the benefits of slavery—we deny altogether the justice and propriety of Mr. Fisher's mode of estimating the comparative wealth of States, by adding the value of the slaves to the sum of other wealth, and subtracting their number from the population, used in calculating the average wealth of the community. It is easy to show that the whole population of the States compared ought to be used in the calculation; or, if a certain class of people be deducted in one of the States, the corresponding class ought to be deducted in the other. The slaves in Virginia do the same sort of labor, and occupy the same situation as the hired laborers in free States. The difference between them is, that hired men work by contract for wages, while slaves do the same work without contract, for whatsoever their masters may choose to allow them. The hired laborer may hold property, but generally possesses little of it; the slave can have no property, but as commonly allowed to use the necessary supply for his physical wants.

Every civilized society is composed chiefly of two classes—capitalists, who employ the labor of others, and laborers, who work for the capitalists. Some, it is true, are both capitalists and laborers; that is, they work with their own capital, like the small farmer who cultivates his land by his own labor. But these make no difference in the present case. Every free State has a class of hired laborers, who do the same part for their employers that slaves do for their masters. The object of the present inquiry is to know whether the system of employing free labor is or is not more productive of wealth than the system of employing slave labor. We have to determine the question by comparing the results of each system, in communities where they have operated under equal circumstances of time and of physical advantage and disadvantage.

Now in comparing the results, as between New York or Pennsylvania on the one side, and Virginia or North Carolina on the other, it is obvious that no just conclusion can be attained, unless we compare the two communities either class by class, as capitalists with capitalists, laborers with laborers, or the whole of the one with the whole of the other, and make a general average of their wealth. In the slave States, the slaves are distinctly enumerated in taking the census; but the free laborers of the other States are not; so that we cannot make the comparison class by class. We have, therefore, to make a general average of the whole population, and this serves best to determine the general effect of the two sorts of labor upon the wealth of the community, though it does not show how the aggregate wealth is distributed among the several classes.

ously true and just, that we are confident of its appearing so to every reader of common candor and intelligence.

But we will give a brief illustration, to make it plain to the meanest capacity. Suppose two farmers, one in a free State and one in a slaveholding State; each cultivating 200 acres of land, and employing ten hands. The northern farmer employs free labor, which costs him the board and wages of the laborers, and nothing more. The southern farmer employs his own slaves, whose labor costs him, first, the interest of the capital which he has invested in slaves, and, secondly, the maintenance of such a number of slaves, old and young, male and female, sound and unsound, and will afford him a constant supply of ten working hands. Now to prevent any one from mistaking the point at issue, we will suppose that those farmers can each make a clear profit of \$1000 a year by the cultivation of his land. Then, to all intents and purposes, they are equally rich and prosperous. "No," says Mr. Fisher, by no means. "And why not?" Because (says Mr. Fisher) the slaves are property, and you must add their value to the southern farmer's estate, and allow him the whole amount; but the free laborers are citizens, and you must divide the northern farmer's wealth with them, and allow him only the average share of all that they have among them. So the southern farmer will be about ten times as rich as the northern."

We reply, finally, that all this is absurd; because we have supposed the northern farmer to make as much profit by his free labor, as the other makes by his slaves. All we have to do is to ascertain whether or not the northern people, on the whole, make as much by their free labor, as the southern do by their slave labor; and the way to ascertain it, is to divide the amount of wealth which each people, capitalists and laborers, have made by the number engaged in making it—that is, by the whole population. The result will show, whether a community, all free, makes a larger or smaller product, than an equal number of persons, partly free and partly slaves, will make—allowance being made for difference of natural advantages in the two countries. Surely we need say no more on this point.

But there is another connected with it.—In estimating the relative wealth of two States, ought the value of the slaves to be added to that of other property? Our answer is, that it depends upon circumstances. If a State breeds slaves for exportation to other countries, and makes a profit by this business, as slave-breeds make a profit out of their capital invested in mares and jackasses—then speaking economically, not morally, the capital thus invested in the business of breeding slaves, for exportation, is productive capital, and fairly constitutes a portion of the wealth of the slave breeders. But, apart from this business of rearing slaves for foreign markets, the solution of the question depends entirely upon the fact, whether slave-labor is or is not more profitable than free-labor. If in the long-run, and upon the whole, an equal number of free-laborers in the country would make as much profit for the capitalists (to say nothing of what they might make for themselves) then it is evident that the existence of slavery in the country adds nothing to its wealth; and slaves should not be reckoned, as constituting any portion of the general wealth of a State, whatever they may be to individuals who sell them. If they be sold by one citizen to another for home use, the price is no evidence of their being an addition to the general wealth of the slaveholders. They may command a price when sold, for two reasons, independent of their superior value to the owner above that of hired laborers.

One reason is, that the existence of slavery makes it impracticable to obtain hired free laborers of good quality and in sufficient numbers to supersede the use of slaves. This circumstance, and established custom, keep up a domestic demand for slaves, and give them an incidental value, when intrinsically they are unprofitable stock.

The other reason is the foreign demand for slaves. The owner in Virginia or Kentucky may, if he chooses, sell his slaves to a slave-trader for exportation. This gives an exchangeable value to this species of live stock, quite independent of any use or profit that can be made of it at home. He who looks upon negroes as a sort of beasts, created for the use of the white man, will always value them as property in reference to their price in the slave market.

Now, since in the northern States, free-laborers do for capitalists the same service that slaves do in Virginia and Kentucky, we can discover whether the estimated value of our slaves ought to be added, when we compare the wealth of States; and the way to discover it, is to make the comparison first without putting in the value of the slaves. Compare the wealth of the free and the slave States, so far as it consists in lands, buildings, and all other products of labor, making allowance for natural advantages and disadvantages in each country.—If, in proportion to population, the slave State has more wealth than the free State, then you have evidence that slave-labor has produced more wealth in the one State, than free-labor has produced in the other—that is, each slave has added more wealth to the general stock, than each free-laborer; and therefore the value of slaves should be added to the other wealth, because they are a source of wealth to the country, not merely as men but as slaves. Their slavery has made the general labor of the country more productive of wealth, than if their place had been occupied by free laborers.

If, after deducting the slave property, the old southern States be less wealthy than the old free States, in proportion to population, then the slaves ought not to be considered as wealth, because they are in fact a hindrance to the prosperity of the country, and less productive as laborers than free-men would be in their places.

Tried on this indisputably just principle, not one of the old slave States can stand a comparison with the free States in regard to wealth and prosperity. Having settled these important principles let us return to Mr. Fisher.

Having, in exact contrariety to both these principles, added the slaves to the stock of southern wealth, and subtracted them from the southern population and thus made the average of southern wealth in 1815 a little higher than that of the north; he next

South, at this period, excelled the north in proportion to the numbers of the population. In 1810, the fabrics of wool, cotton and linen, manufactured in the northern States, were valued at \$21,061,525, whilst the south fabricated to the value of \$13,711,721." So says Mr. Fisher, and he says no more, to prove that the south excelled the north in manufactures. As the fabrics named constituted only one of many sorts of manufactures, we have one of a number of instances, in which he makes his conclusion much broader than his premises; or, as the logicians say, draws a universal conclusion on from particular premises, in violation of all sound reasoning.

But this is not all. His own statement disproves his assertion that the southern States then excelled the north, even in the fabrics named—"in proportion to the numbers of the population," if he meant the whole population, as every reader would understand him. In 1810, the northern States contained 3,763,800 inhabitants; the southern, 3,489,900. Dividing the cloth manufactures of each section by its population, we get \$5.58 cents per head for the north, and \$4.53 cents per head for the south.—What sort of excellence is this?

It should be remarked, that in 1810, the improved system of manufacturing by machinery, was scarcely begun in the United States. The old system of household manufacturing, produced nearly all the fabrics above mentioned.

Having thus in his peculiar way attempted to demonstrate the superior prosperity of the south in 1815, he then observes that since the year 1816 "great changes have occurred." "The grass is growing in the streets of those cities of the south, which maintained their ascendancy in the earlier years of the Union. Manufactures and Arts have gone to take up their abode in the north. Cities have been expanded and multiplied in the same favored region.—Railroads and canals have been constructed, and Education has delighted there to build her colleges and academies."

Mr. Fisher not only admits the decline of the south; he laments it as deeply disastrous. It affected chiefly her cities, her commerce, and her manufactures. These things with railroads and canals, arts and education, he now considers as important elements of public prosperity. He impresses upon us the importance of them, when he takes the strain of the South Carolina nullifiers, and attributes the decline of the South to the Tariff policy of the Federal Government. Listen, good reader, to his lamentations over the fallen south. "When, therefore, (says he) the statesmen of the south reflect on the great commercial and manufacturing prosperity of the country, in the days of direct taxation, and behold now her dilapidated cities and deserted harbors, under the change of system, is it wonderful that they have made the halls of Congress eloquent with the ruin and wrong that they have suffered?"

Could language more strongly express the sentiment of Mr. Fisher, that cities, commerce, and manufactures, are so important elements of prosperity, that their decline be ruinous to the country? Let the reader bear this in mind, while we remark that it is absurd to charge this decline upon the Tariff policy, which operated equally on all parts of the country, unless the same policy produced similar effects in the north; which it did not. And how could high duties on foreign cloths depress those household manufactures of cloth, which existed in 1810? And if such duties started in the north the system of manufacturing by machinery, why should not the same effect have followed in the south? We are not discussing the wisdom of the Tariff policy, but the question, whether policy was the cause, why the north has run so far ahead of the south in population, commerce and manufactures. We affirm that it was not—that it could not be. There is another and deeper cause—slavery; and, strange to say, this same Mr. Fisher who denies it to have been the cause, here on page 4, commences immediately to deny that the South has declined at all! While he is echoing the death-song of the nullifiers, all is decline and ruin and wrong; but the moment that he finds the north attributing the decline of the south to her "peculiar institution," he turns short round and commences an elaborate argument to prove that the south, instead of declining, has, by the creative energy of her slave system, grown in wealth and prosperity beyond the most prosperous of the northern States. He has scarcely done so, when he begins to congratulate the same south upon the absence of cities and manufactures—to pronounce, that old Virginia, "instead of being poor and in need of pity, is perhaps the richest community in the world; and that the free people of the slaveholding States, which are uniformly regarded as the victims of poverty and ruin, are all richer, much richer than those of the non-slaveholding States." When done with proving these assertions, he demonstrates (in his own opinion) that cities are a nuisance, manufactures and commerce unprofitable, and that agriculture—especially with slave-labor—is the grand source of wealth, and comfort, and virtue, and high civilization.

Having thus marked out his shiftings and fro, let us see how he attempts to make out the superior wealth and prosperity of the southern States.

On page 5, he commences the process by first comparing the present condition of Massachusetts with that of Maryland. He calculates the average wealth of the "white people" in each, by taking as a basis the conjectured value of the property of Massachusetts, and the assessed value of property in Maryland, including slaves.

We have given abundant reason for rejecting Mr. Fisher's method of considering slaves as making a part of the wealth, but no part of the population of the Southern States. We have given valid reason for not considering slaves as wealth, except on certain conditions. We also remarked that assessments of property, as a basis of taxation, were apt to be incorrect; and we now add that assessments in different States are often made on different principles, with reference to different species of property, and with very different degrees of care and accuracy. They cannot be relied on, therefore, as a true exhibition of the comparative wealth of States.

there are special objections to his comparison between Maryland and Massachusetts. He understates the whole property of Massachusetts at 300 millions of dollars, referring vaguely to the newspapers as his authority. It will not do. Last year the taxable property of Boston was assessed at \$162,360,000. The population of Boston is about one-seventh of the total population of the State. The other towns near it contain about half the number of people in Boston, and considerable wealth. The city of Salem was assessed at \$10,000,000. Then there is the great manufacturing city of Lowell, with a large capital; the other inland cities of Worcester and Springfield, and the sea ports of Marblehead, New Bedford, Nantucket, Plymouth, and others, with large quantities of shipping, besides other wealth. No less than 12,000 are engaged in the fisheries. Then there is the land of the State, and hundreds of villages. Now if Boston and Salem are assessed at \$12,000,000, can we imagine that the whole State is worth but 300,000. The supposition is unfeasible.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Smithsonian Institution.

The National Intelligencer has the following notice of the proceedings of the Board of Regents of this Institution, which met at Washington on Monday last:

Mr. SEATON, on behalf of the Executive Committee, presented a report of the state of the funds of the Institution. From this report, it appears that its financial affairs are in a very prosperous condition.—At the time of the establishment of the institution, in addition to the original fund of \$514,169, there had accrued, in the form of interest, \$242,129; the latter sum the Regents were authorized, by the act of Congress, to expend for the erection of a building, and for other purposes. They have, however, thus far encroached upon this sum only to the amount of about \$30,000; and it is confidently believed, that, by adhering to the plan of finance adopted, at the end of three years, (within which time the building is to be completed) there will be left at least \$150,000 of interest, to be added to the original principal for other objects of the bequest.

General TOTTEN, from the building committee, reported upon the progress of the Smithsonian edifice. From this it appears that the east wing will be finished by the first of January, and the west wing early in the spring. The main part of the building has been commenced, and from the results thus far, it is confidently expected that the building will be completed, and the grounds improved for the sum of \$250,000, appropriated by the board for these purposes.

The Secretary, Professor HENRY, presented his report of the operations of the past year, from which we glean the following particulars:

The programme of organization has been submitted to a number of literary and scientific societies, and has, in every case, received their approbation. The officers of these institutions have expressed a willingness to co-operate with this institution in carrying out the plans which have been adopted. Until the end of three years from next March, only one-half of the income of the original fund is to be appropriated to the active operations of the institution, the other part of the whole income to be devoted to the building fund; and, therefore, the institution cannot be put into full operation until after the end of the time above-mentioned.

It will be recollected that the programme embraces: 1st, the plan of publishing original memoirs on all branches of knowledge, in a series of volumes; 2dly, the institution of original researches under the direction of suitable persons; 3dly, the publication of a series of reports, from year to year, giving an account of the progress of the different branches of knowledge; and, 4thly, the foundation of a library and a museum of objects of nature and art.

The first volume of the contributions has been published, and partially distributed to colleges and learned societies. Before the types were distributed, the authors were permitted to strike off an addition for their own benefit, and it is this addition which is now offered for sale. Applications have been made for the first volume from many academies and minor institutions, and were the means sufficient for the purpose, the institution would supply all demands; but, with its limited income, this is impossible. The periodical reports, however, being less expensive, will be much more widely distributed. Preparations have been made for the publication of the second volume of the contributions, and a sufficient number of memoirs have been already accepted, or are in preparation, to supply the materials.

Under the second head is mentioned the publication of observations for facilitating the determination of the longitude of important places, ordered at the last meeting of the Board. These have been so well received that another set has been prepared, and is now ready for distribution, for 1849, among all persons interested in practical astronomy. An ephemeris has also been prepared, and published, of the planets Neptune. A beginning has been made towards establishing a system of meteorological observations, ordered at the last meeting, the blank forms being now in the hands of the lithographer, and will shortly be ready to send to those who may be willing to join in the observations. Several sets of instruments have been sent to remote stations on the coast of the Pacific, and in the interior of our continent, and investigations in reference to terrestrial magnetism have been instituted. Under the auspices of the institution, an important literary enterprise has been commenced, namely: the preparation of a biographical account of all books relating to or published in America prior to the year 1700; the expense of preparation of this work being defrayed by the subscriptions of a number of institutions. This work will indicate the libraries in this country and Europe where the books are to be found. Instruments have been ordered for observations in astronomy, magnetism, and other terrestrial phenomena, to be placed under the direction of Lieutenant Gillies, in his expedition to Chili. These, it is hoped, will be paid for, by a further appropriation by the general government towards

With regard to the periodical report to be published, we learn the following particulars: These reports are to be as extensively circulated as the funds of the institution will allow, and are intended to give an account of the progress of the different branches of knowledge throughout the world. In many cases, the periodical reports will be preceded by preliminary reports on the previous state of the branch of knowledge to which the former pertain.—A number of these are in process of preparation, namely: one upon chemistry, applied to agriculture; one upon the forest trees of America; one on the phenomena of lightning; one on the later discoveries in astronomy; and on the practical use of meteorological instruments.

Appended to the Secretary's report, is the report of the assistant Secretary, (Professor Jewett) on the library, an account of which we will give our readers in a future number.

Professor Henry's report ends with an allusion to the munificent donation of Dr. Hare, of Philadelphia.

From the National Era.

Thoughts for the People.

INTERNATIONAL WAR.

The question of the right of Governments to enforce their mandates by the sword; of a nation to defend itself, when attacked, after having done all it could to avert the blow; of an injured people to sheath the sword against oppressive rulers; and of an individual to shed blood in self-defence, are all grave questions. No possible objection can be raised to a full and free discussion of them.

But, totally distinct from all these, is the question of International War for the settlement of national controversies. From time immemorial, the custom has prevailed. Christians of the first and second centuries strenuously opposed: those of the third, by degrees, fell in; since which, little opposition has been offered, Christianity having rather to mitigate the evils of war, than to remove the causes. If we except the Quakers and a few peace men, liberally branded with the epithets of enthusiasts and fanatics, very few have made anything like an earnest resistance to the custom of war. Like rowdies, whose honor must be intact, who spurn the slow movements of law and public opinion, the nations, after little or no effort at negotiation, have rushed to the combat. The custom has become old. It is time-honored. Its evils have pressed heavily upon the millions, but they have learned to bear them without thinking why. War-rulers do not like to have us think. They would have us obey rather. If we were to think, we might propose troublesome questions. We might ask why is the war; is it sustained at such immense expenses of life and treasure? They would not love to answer, "for the special benefit of a few, who thereby contrive to figure in the world's history."

The interested few, I doubt not, the people at large, who love war. They and their friends have made it about as much as one's reputation for common sense, for civility even, is worth, to speak against the system.

An unmeaning wrangle about the national honor, an everlasting ringing of changes on the importance of being always prepared for war, and fulsome glorification of military men, got up and kept up, generally by themselves and their partisans, and rendered the war system, till of late, seemingly impregnable. Men dared not speak and write their thoughts. But "a better time" has come. We may now ask questions, and answer them if we can. We may inquire, whence originated the custom of war? By whose auspices is it sustained? Who bear its burdens? Who suffer by it? Can no profit by it? Is it necessary? Can no substitute be introduced? Why cannot the controversies of nations, like those of individuals, be adjudicated in some common sense, rational way? I advise the reader to push these inquiries to a satisfactory solution. Why should we fail to be informed on questions of so much interest? Happily, books adapted to aid the investigation are now offered to the public. "The Peace Manual," which is, or ought to be, for sale at all the book-stores, will show facts and re-assertions of which few are aware.

"Jay's Review of the Late War," a thoroughly searching, but most impartial work, will throw a flood of light on the above inquiries. Other works now offered to the public are worthy of commendation. Read, think and decide. Every American citizen ought to be able to sustain the war system intelligently, or to condemn it earnestly.

PACIFIC.

A water-mill is necessarily located in the country afar from the cities, the markets and magazines of labor, upon which it must be dependent. Water appears to run very cheaply, but it always rents for a pretty high price, and the first cost of dams, races, water-wheels, &c., is on an average quite as great as that of a steam engine and engine, and the annual repairs are, at least, equal. No casualty, entailing unexpected expense, ever need happen to a steam engine; while water-mills are always liable to injury or destruction from floods; and the interruption of work from low water is a continual and very expensive drawback. A man acts down his steam engine where he pleases—that is, where it is most to his interest to plant it, in the midst of the industry and markets, both for supply and consumption of a great city; where he is sure always having hands near him, without loss of time in seeking for them, and where he can buy his raw materials and sell his goods, without adding the expense of a double transportation.

The expense of a steam engine is not much if it is well managed. It should be of sufficient capacity to work all the machinery with ease, without using steam at a high pressure. It should be as carefully attended as a clock—nothing should be referred to go out of repair from carelessness, and nothing should be wasted from neglect. Scientific American.

Hon. Alex. Ramsey, the new Governor of Minnesota, was fifteen years ago, a journeyman cabinet maker, then attended a manual labor school, afterwards studied law, subsequently became a member of Congress, and now is Governor of Minn.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PITTSBURGH GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—We condense the report of the second day's proceedings as published in the Pittsburgh papers.

SUNDAY, May 15. The Assembly met pursuant to adjournment, and was opened with prayer, by the Moderator. Hon. Walter Lowrie submitted the report of the Board of Foreign Missions. From this report, it appears that the receipts were \$110,586, 40—expenditures, \$110,634, 20.

Dr. Plummer presented the Report of the Committee on church music, appointed by the last Assembly, which was read.

The report urges among other things the purification of church music books of all light and theatrical tones, and the exclusion of the employment of irreligious persons to lead that branch of public worship. It also reflects upon the custom of choirs cultivating music to such an extent as to prevent the congregation from joining in the singing of the psalms.

The report was accepted, and a motion was made to print 250 copies of the appendix, containing, which were recommended by the Board of Foreign Missions. This motion was over-ruled by the reference of the whole matter to a special committee.

Mr. Vangilder read the Report of Matthew Newkirk, Treasurer, exhibiting:

Balance on hand, \$2,224, 11

Received last year, \$16,007, 52

Making a total of \$18,231, 63

Expenses, \$18,231, 63

Leaving on hand \$2,224, 11

The income from stocks owned by Assembly amounts to \$6,343, 30. The same investments appear to be worth little or nothing.

Dr. Phillips from the Committee on Christian Union, reported a series of resolutions adopted at a convention called by them, urging the union of all the branches of the Presbyterian church into one body. The report was accepted and appropriately referred.

The report of James M. Donald, delegate to the General Conference of Maine, was read and ordered to be printed in the appendix. His report stated that the position of the Assembly on the slavery question, had dissatisfied that body; but the delegates referred to the action of 1818 to repudiate the charge, and assumed that the Assembly regards slavery as sinful.

Mr. Jaseway moved to proceed now to choose the place of next meeting. Amended so as to make the time next Tuesday morning at 9 o'clock. Adjourned with prayer.

Among the representatives to the Presbyterian General Assembly, at Pittsburgh, we find the names of the following from Kentucky:

Presbytery. Ministers. Elders.

Louisville. W. W. Hunt. H. H. Hunt.

Richmond. E. D. Hunt. W. M. Lamson (2).

Transylvania. J. H. Hunt.

W. Lexington. John D. Hunt.

Cherokee. R. H. Hunt.

The following are the officers of the Presbyterian General Assembly, now in session at Pittsburgh:

Rev. NICHOLAS MURRAY, D. D., Moderator.

Rev. WILLIS LORR, D. D., Stated Clerk.

Rev. R. DAVISON, D. D., Permanent Clerk.

Rev. W. M. HILL, Temporary Clerk.

The Presbyterian General Assembly, (new school), is to hold its next session at Detroit, Michigan. Of the proceedings of this body at Philadelphia, on Saturday, the North American says:

On slavery there was a very large number of resolutions, one of which, from the Presbytery of Palestine, threatened to separate from the church unless something is done to relieve the church from the odium of slavery. All these papers call for the separation of the church from the evil and odium of slavery, and speak in strong terms of reprobation of the church having any connection with it. They were referred to a special committee of seven.

A FACT DAY FOR PRESBYTERIANS.—The Presbyterian conference, (new school), which is in session in Philadelphia, has appointed the first Monday in January, 1850, to be observed as a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer by the church throughout the U. S.

AGRICULTURAL.

A NEW MANURE.—Robert Bryson, Esq., of Cumberland county, about eight miles from Harrisburg, Pa., has been experimenting for the last ten years, to make exhausted land back available and valuable as manure. Besides his magnificent farm, he likewise carries on the tanning business. Finally, after a great deal of expense, and many failures, he has succeeded in discovering a method of producing from the tan an efficient manure. This is his plan: He has tan wheeled out on a level piece of ground,